

### REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed **April 30, 2003** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-24. The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because the length exceeds 150 words. Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schneider et al (USPN 6,105,027, hereinafter "Schneider").

#### Objections to the Specification

The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because the length exceeds 150 words.

Applicant has amended the abstract of the disclosure so that it contains no more than 150 words. No new matter has been added.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 were rejected as being anticipated by Schneider.

Applicant respectfully points out that Schneider is directed to controlling **access to information resources provided by servers on a network** by using access filters (see Schneider, Abstract and col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 27).

In contrast, the present invention provides a database system which allows **specific rows containing sensitive data within a table to be marked as sensitive** while other rows within the table need not contain sensitive data (see page 4, lines 2-4, page 7, lines 1-2, and dependent claims 6, 14, and 22 of the instant application). Allowing specific rows containing sensitive data within a table to be marked as sensitive while other rows within the table need not contain sensitive data is different from controlling access to information resources provided by servers on a network.

It is advantageous to be able to allow specific rows containing sensitive data within a table to be marked as sensitive while other rows within the table need not be marked sensitive because it allows information related to, for example, a specific

person or project to be hidden from normal users and administrators. Only users and administrators empowered to access sensitive data can access these specific rows. There is nothing within Schneider, either explicit or implicit, that would suggest an advantage for specific rows containing sensitive data within a table to be marked as sensitive while other rows within the table need not contain sensitive data.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 to include the limitation “wherein the sensitive object can include a sensitive row within a table in the database system, wherein the sensitive row contains sensitive data , and wherein other rows in the table need not contain sensitive data” from dependent claims 6, 14, and 22, respectively. Dependent claims 6, 14, and 22 have been amended to delete this limitation. These amendments find support on page 4, lines 2-4 and on page 7, lines 1-2 of the instant application.


Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-16, which depend upon claim 9, and claims 18-24, which depend upon claim 17, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.



CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Edward J. Grundler  
Registration No. 41,241

Date: July 16, 2003

**RECEIVED**

JUL 23 2003

Technology Center 2100

Edward J. Grundler  
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 Second Street, Suite 201  
Davis, CA 95616-4692  
Tel: (530) 759-1663  
FAX: (530) 759-1665